

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE

DATE: JANUARY 26, 2015

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS TAYLOR
 MONROE
 VANSELOW
 SEEBER
 GIRARD

OTHERS PRESENT:

KEVIN GERAGHTY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
MARTIN AUFFREDOU, COUNTY ATTORNEY
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD
FRANK E. THOMAS, BUDGET OFFICER
SUPERVISORS BROCK
 MERLINO
 SIMPSON
GRETCHEN STEFFAN, COUNTY HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR
CHARLENE DiRESTA, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

Mr. Taylor called the meeting of the Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee to order at 11:08 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Monroe, seconded by Mr. Vanselow and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the previous meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Copies of the Agenda were distributed to the Committee members; *a copy of the Agenda is on file with the minutes.* Gretchen Steffan, County Human Resources Director, distributed copies of a memorandum, written by herself in reference to the draft performance evaluation forms, to the Committee members; *a copy of the memorandum is on file with the minutes.*

Commencing the Agenda review, Mr. Taylor stated the only item pertained to continued discussion regarding the preparation of a performance evaluation form for the County Administrator position. He noted the Agenda included draft performance evaluation forms which were prepared by Ms. Seeber. He said the draft forms included one for use by the Committee and one for use by the individual Supervisors. He pointed out the Committee members had just received the memorandum from Ms. Steffan in reference to these forms which should be addressed because Ms. Steffan had some concerns with the 5 performance elements.

Ms. Seeber requested a moment for the Committee members to review the memorandum as it had not been received in advance of the Committee meeting. She pointed out it had been mentioned in previous Committee meetings that it was preferable for all information to be sent out in advance of the meeting to allow time for the members to review it. Paul Dusek, County Administrator, said he and Ms. Steffan had not been involved in this part of the process. He advised he had received Ms. Seeber's draft forms on Friday, January 23, 2015 and he had forwarded the information to Ms. Steffan as soon as his schedule allowed because he felt it was important for the County Human Resources Director to be involved in the performance evaluation process. Ms. Seeber said she was confused since she had sent the draft documents to Chairman Geraghty and Mr. Taylor prior to the January 16, 2015 Board meeting. She noted she had been requested to provide the draft forms to Chairman Geraghty and Mr. Taylor prior to disseminating them to the rest of the Committee members; she added it had been determined that Mr. Taylor would then forward the information to the appropriate people. Ms. Seeber clarified that although she had drafted the proposed forms, the Committee had developed the performance elements which had been agreed upon at the previous Committee meeting and the question had been the appropriate form(s) for use in the performance evaluation. Mr. Dusek reiterated he had not received Ms. Seeber's draft forms until

Friday, January 23, 2015 when he forwarded the information to Ms. Steffan. He added this was why Ms. Steffan had been unable to provide her memorandum prior to the Committee meeting. Mr. Taylor advised he had forwarded the draft proposed performance evaluation forms to the Committee members but he had neglected to send them to Mr. Dusek and Ms. Steffan for which he apologized. Mr. Taylor asked the Committee members to take a moment to review the memorandum from Ms. Steffan.

Ms. Seeber commented the memorandum stated there had been no recommendation of a self evaluation on the proposed forms and she pointed out she had not been tasked with the development of a self evaluation form; however, she continued, the proposed "Committee Review Form" did include a check box for self evaluation. She said she recognized the importance of the self evaluation to the performance evaluation process. Ms. Seeber informed she had been contacted by a Town of Queensbury resident with concerns pertaining to the possible self evaluation of the County Administrator as it related to Section 8 of the Warren County Ethics and Disclosure Law; she explained the resident felt that Section 8 would prohibit the County Administrator from having input in his own performance evaluation rating, to be on or have any influence on the Committee that determined what criteria he would be rated on. She said Martin Auffredou, County Attorney, had said he would be available to provide an explanation to the Committee upon request. It was the consensus of the Committee that Mr. Auffredou be asked to join the meeting and Joan Sady, Clerk of the Board, left the meeting to request his attendance.

Mr. Taylor advised he had drafted a document entitled "Procedure for Completing Performance Review of the County Administrator" and he distributed copies of this document to the Committee members; *a copy of same is on file with the minutes*. In reference to the document, Ms. Seeber asked if the County had established an Executive Committee and Chairman Geraghty replied in the negative. Chairman Geraghty stated this Committee would most likely consist of himself as the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors; the Budget Officer; the Chairman of the Personnel Committee; and perhaps the Chairman of the Finance Committee. Chairman Geraghty asked Mr. Dusek if he agreed these would be the appropriate members and Ms. Dusek replied these would be the Supervisors who he had the most contact with and were also the people who generally discussed any major issues the County faced.

Mr. Auffredou entered the Committee meeting at 11:19 a.m.

Mr. Taylor explained to Mr. Auffredou that there was concern about a possible ethics violation regarding Section 8 of the Warren County Ethics and Disclosure Law with regard to the self evaluation of the County Administrator. Mr. Auffredou stated his understanding was the question pertained to recusal and abstention and Ms. Seeber said this was the matter she had previously brought to Mr. Auffredou's attention. Ms. Seeber mentioned she did not believe the resident was indicating there had been an ethics violation but merely a matter of concern from the previous Committee meeting.

Mr. Auffredou commented that to the extent which Mr. Dusek would have involvement or would be considering standards, criteria or objectives for performance evaluation, he did not view this ethics provision in the code as addressing this at all. He explained he viewed the provision as saying the involvement could not include deliberation with the intention of voting on the performance evaluation rating. He said the Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee was moving forward to try to get the best evaluative criteria and it would seem to him that the Committee would value the input and consideration of the County Administrator or any other Department Head to be evaluated. He stated it would ultimately be the decision of the Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee to

determine the criteria. Mr. Auffredou stated he did not see Section 8 as applying in this instance. He explained he viewed this provision as pertaining to a member of the Board of Supervisors being prohibited from voting on a contract or policy which could directly lead to their financial interests. He stated he did not feel that assisting a Committee with the development of criteria for a performance evaluation applied in this instance. He presented the example of having a financial interest in a business and being involved in enabling that business to contract with the County and he stated the intention of this provision was to ensure this example did not happen. Mr. Taylor said it was not unusual to have self evaluation be part of the review process. He said each employee would have goals and the self evaluation would allow them to state how they felt they had met those goals.

Mr. Auffredou stated he had very little involvement in this process; however, he added, he hoped when the Committee established the criteria for the County Attorney position that they would request and consider input from him. He said it was ultimately the Supervisors who would determine what the criteria for each position should be. Ms. Seeber clarified the resident's concern was not about the self evaluation but pertained more to the fact that the County Administrator would have input to the rating Committee. She said the resident felt there should be a clear division between developing the criteria and self evaluation. Mr. Auffredou asked if the Committee intended to have Department Heads also complete a self evaluation as part of the review process and Mr. Taylor replied affirmatively. Mr. Auffredou informed when he was an associate with a law firm, he felt having an individual rate and evaluate themselves was a valuable tool to assist the employer in the evaluation of that employee.

Mr. Brock mentioned it was common practice in many companies for self evaluation to be part of the performance evaluation process and Ms. Steffan agreed. Mr. Monroe commented the military asked soldiers to evaluate their own performance. Ms. Steffan stated self evaluation was one of the fundamentals of participatory management and involving someone in the process eliminated the resistance they might have if they were not included. Ms. Seeber clarified the concern by reading the following question from the resident: "(they) were not sure if Section 8 prohibited the County Administrator from participating in negotiating the terms of his own one-on-one deal for performance pay because it was strictly for his position and not County wide". She said she felt this question had arisen because they had veered off topic at the last Committee meeting and had discussed salary increases being based on performance ratings. Mr. Auffredou responded he did not think that Section 8 of the Warren County Ethics and Disclosure Law precluded the County Administrator from participating in this process to the extent that he had participated thus far.

Mr. Auffredou exited the Committee meeting at 11:27 a.m.

Mr. Taylor requested Ms. Steffan to address her comments from the memorandum pertaining to the proposed performance evaluation forms. He stated his only concern was that the Committee develop the best possible evaluation form. He advised that as the County Human Resources Director, Ms. Steffan had raised some concerns and it was important for the Committee to listen to her comments and act accordingly.

Ms. Steffan reminded the Committee members of her short presentation involving the strategic planning process which had been given at the January 7, 2015 meeting. She advised the position of County Administrator was the equivalent of a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) for a private sector business; she added the Board of Supervisors was the equivalent of a Board of Directors. She noted the County Administrator was involved in the day-to-day operations of Warren County. She said her recommendation in the memorandum pertaining to the competencies valued by the organization was

made because anyone in the chief executive position should be evaluated on some very high level of competencies. Ms. Steffan pointed out the proposed performance evaluation form contained 5 performance elements and there was some deviation between the titles and the descriptions which could be confusing. She commented the proposed performance evaluation forms also did not provide the depth that she would be looking for in a CEO evaluation. She mentioned a CEO would be held to a very high standard, as would the County Administrator. She pointed out the Committee members had received a draft copy of the County Administrator's goals which contained 12 complex goals that she tried to place into 7 categories. She mentioned this evaluation would be the beginning of a system because after the performance evaluation for the County Administrator was completed the next step would be to complete Department Head evaluations. She expressed the need for consistency in the type of form used.

Pertaining to the self evaluation, Ms. Steffan commented no one would do a better job of evaluating performance than the employee in question. She noted an employee in a position, such as the County Administrator, would keep continuous documentation over the course of the work cycle to ensure they could speak to their performance expectations during the evaluation. She stated the self evaluation was a critical part of this process. She mentioned the possibility of having an Executive Committee to evaluate performance because she did not feel all 20 Supervisors having an equal vote in the process was ideal for our environment. She noted the County currently had an Administrator but it would be necessary to look at succession and competencies, such as leadership, communication, decision making skills, etc. which were the key elements an Administrator should be evaluated on. She stated if the County was looking to hire a new County Administrator it would be reasonable to look for the attributes listed on her memorandum.

Mr. Taylor commented the memorandum contained 18 performance elements (competencies) and he opined this seemed like a lot; Ms. Steffan agreed but noted there was some crossover and the potential to combine some items depending on the descriptions used. Mr. Brock questioned why Ms. Steffan did not feel all 20 Supervisors should be included in the evaluation process. Ms. Steffan clarified that during her previous presentation there had been several documents, one of which had been an evaluation form she felt would be appropriate for all 20 Supervisors; however, she continued, each vote of the Supervisors should not be weighted in a way that resulted in the average of the 20 ratings determining the overall evaluation rating. She said the decision of the evaluation rating should be determined by the Executive Committee. She reiterated the Executive Committee members would most likely be the Supervisors who were the most familiar with the daily work completed by the County Administrator. She commented there might be several members of the Board of Supervisors who had very limited interaction with the County Administrator and their evaluations should not be weighted the same as Supervisors who had a great deal of interaction with him. Mr. Brock stated he did not necessarily disagree with Ms. Steffan's opinion; however, he added, all 20 Supervisors were accountable to their constituents. He suggested the possibility of all 20 Supervisors completing an evaluation, as well as the Executive Committee. Ms. Steffan agreed and said the Board of Supervisors was our system of government and everyone should have a voice; however, she continued, ultimately the evaluation should be written by the Executive Committee. She noted this was the way evaluations were handled in most corporations and Mr. Brock countered that corporations were different than government. Referring to his handout entitled "Procedure for Completing Performance Review of the County Administrator", Mr. Taylor commented he had suggested that each Supervisor complete a review to be used as a tool by the Executive Committee during their evaluation.

Ms. Seeber explained the performance elements had been determined at the previous Committee meeting and it was necessary to determine an appropriate form for the evaluation. She said she had

met with Ms. Steffan who had provided a rating form that she utilized within her Department. Ms. Seeber stated this rating form had been used as a template in the development of the forms included in the Agenda packet. She advised she had discussed this issue with agencies, such as other Counties, the New York State Association of Counties (NYSAC), the Soil and Water Conservation District and the Warren/Hamilton County Community Action Agency. She informed these agencies had suggested that because the position of County Administrator was different from any other County position, there was the possibility of developing a system that would allow each Supervisor to have some input on the performance evaluation. She noted the Executive Committee would then have access to confidential input from each of the 20 Supervisors, as well as the more public document which would be the final performance evaluation. Ms. Seeber stated all of the Supervisors had interaction with Mr. Dusek and they all had goals that they reported to their constituents. She commented her concept involved taking the average of the 20 ratings from the Supervisors to be presented to the Executive Committee. She noted there was ample room on the proposed forms to allow for further explanation of the ratings provided. She advised this concept was a fair way for each of the 20 Supervisors to have input into the performance evaluation. A brief discussion ensued.

Ms. Steffan opined that unless each member of the Board of Supervisors kept detailed documentation on the County Administrator position, during the performance evaluation they would only be rating based on the big, the bad and the recent events that they remembered. She said the individuals performance would then be evaluated on what was remembered versus what was documented. She reiterated her recommendation was that the Executive Committee write the final performance evaluation.

Mr. Taylor stated that businesses had a Board of Directors who did not participate in the performance evaluations but instead had an employee or committee which was responsible for this. He said he felt 20 performance evaluations would be extremely cumbersome and there was the possibility of the evaluations being skewed based on personal feelings and opinions. Mr. Brock mentioned businesses and government were very different and should not be compared. He said government had the power of taxing and making laws and in business people generally had the same agenda. He stated that when people tried to make government operate like a business they were missing the point. He quoted Tip O'Neill as saying "government ran best when it ran slow" and he said the County needed to run slow and be conservative as to what their goals were. He opined that in order to make the process fair, it would be necessary to go through a cumbersome, drawn out process but that was the reality of government. He added that not doing so would result in Supervisors, who had constituents to answer to, being left out of the process.

Mr. Taylor cautioned that the Committee was spending a lot of time discussing the end result but first it would be necessary to create the form and discuss the review process. Mr. Merlino advised he had attended the majority of the Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee meetings and he felt they were undertaking an impossible task. He pointed out there were Supervisors on the Board who had worked with Mr. Dusek for several years and there were Supervisors who had worked with him for less than two years. He said he understood the concept of each Supervisor having an equal vote and he noted there had been issues in the past with the weighted vote. He presented the example of resolutions failing with 11 Supervisors voting in favor and 9 Supervisors voting in opposition. Mr. Simpson agreed with having the 20 Supervisors complete an evaluation for use by the Executive Committee in determining the performance evaluation. He noted the suggested members of the Executive Committee were the people who worked with Mr. Dusek on a regular basis and had more input in the day-to-day operations of the County. Mr. Monroe stated he was comfortable with the concept of the Executive Committee completing the evaluation based on input that they receive from the individual Supervisors. He commented he did not feel the average of the 20 evaluation ratings

was the best concept because there was the possibility of skewed results if one or more of the Supervisors were not pleased with a particular area. He mentioned another possibility would be to have the Executive Committee complete the evaluation and then hold an executive session during a Personnel Committee or Board meeting to allow the members of the Board an opportunity to provide input on the evaluation.

Mr. Girard commented the evaluation form should be completed by all 20 Supervisors; however, he continued, the County had a Personnel Committee with experience in dealing with personnel issues and he questioned why the performance evaluations would not be completed by this Committee, as opposed to an Executive Committee. Mr. Vanselow agreed with most of Mr. Brock's statements and said he felt the Board of Supervisors did not consist of people who would use the performance evaluation to express personal opinions. He stated all of the members of the Board had relationships with County employees and were capable of completing an unbiased review of the County Administrator position. He questioned the purpose of today's meeting and asked if it was to establish the responsible entity for completing the review or to create the performance evaluation form and Mr. Taylor responded the purpose was to create the form. Mr. Vanselow commented he had attended 3 Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee meetings but had missed the previous meeting where Ms. Seeber had been directed to draft a proposed form. He added Ms. Steffan's memorandum basically nullified Ms. Seeber's proposed form meaning the Committee would need to start the process over again. He voiced his confusion about the last paragraph of the memorandum which referred to election cycles and he asked if Ms. Steffan felt the Executive Committee members were immune from the election cycle. Ms. Steffan explained she meant that the Supervisors who were in the roles of Chairman of the Board, Budget Officer and Chairmen of the Personnel and Finance Committees tended to be the senior members of the Board of Supervisors, as opposed to newly elected members. She said the Chairmen of Personnel and Finance Committees were often involved in the major decisions of the County. She pointed out every two years there was the possibility of "turning over" the Board of Supervisors due to the election results. She mentioned there was an orientation period for new Supervisors for the systems and processes of the County. Mr. Vanselow expressed that every member of the Executive Committee would be subject to the possibility of being defeated in the election or could choose not to run for office again.

Mr. Taylor opined the correct course of action would be to have a smaller group, such as an Executive Committee, complete the final performance evaluation. He said he also felt it would be important to receive input from of every Supervisor on the Board by having them complete an evaluation form. He agreed that the proposed members of the Executive Committee were the Supervisors with the most seniority and experience. He advised the County had made the decision to establish a strong Human Resources Department and Ms. Steffan's comments should not be taken lightly. Mr. Brock pointed out that in order for a salary increase to be approved it would need to be voted on by the Board of Supervisors. He said if there were several Supervisors who disagreed with the performance evaluation completed by the Executive Committee they could vote in opposition of the salary increase. Ms. Steffan interjected that the Board of Supervisors would have the performance evaluation documents available to review and discuss. Mr. Brock countered that you would need to convince those in opposition that the documents were accurate. Mr. Taylor recalled Mr. Monroe had mentioned the possibility of having the Executive Committee complete the performance evaluation to be approved or denied by the Personnel Committee. Mr. Monroe explained the Executive Committee could complete a draft performance evaluation to be reviewed by the Personnel Committee during an executive session. Ms. Seeber stated the purpose of the form was to allow everyone the ability to put their thoughts on paper for consideration by the evaluating committee. When the Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee had first been established, she continued, Chairman Geraghty had indicated that he envisioned the Personnel Committee would complete the performance evaluations. In reference to the comment that the members of the

proposed Executive Committee would be Board members with seniority, Ms. Seeber expressed that this concept would limit the input of new Board members and eliminate the possibility of a well rounded perspective. She opined having the Personnel Committee complete the evaluation would provide a more rounded perspective as the Committee was comprised of members with different levels of seniority. She pointed out the proposed members of the Executive Committee were all representatives of Towns in the northern portion of Warren County and it would be nice to have a more well rounded evaluation team with the Personnel Committee.

Ms. Seeber stated that when she had been requested to draft a proposed performance evaluation form at the previous Committee meeting, she voiced her concern about the possibility of the form not being acceptable to the Committee members making it necessary to go back to the beginning and start over. She said the Committee members had done the necessary research and had solicited input from various sources. She recalled the Committee had indicated they wanted the process to be simple with only a few performance elements. She said she understood Ms. Steffan was commenting that the performance elements were largely immeasurable; however, she asserted, if you asked any of the Committee members about the 5 performance elements, any one of them would be able to provide examples of ways to measure the County Administrator's performance on each. She recalled the Committee had discussed a simple broad document that was easily understandable and solicited the input of the Supervisors. Mr. Taylor advised the Committee members needed to be open to coming up with the best result for this process. He commented that it had been generous of Ms. Seeber to take the time to develop a proposed form but he did not think it was fair to be required to use it. Ms. Seeber reiterated her concern that the Committee would be starting the process all over again. She stated she had used a form which was already in use by the Human Resources Department as a template for her proposed form. The issue, she continued, was not the form but rather the performance elements which the Committee had previously decided upon.

Mr. Dusek mentioned he had been part of the discussions at the past couple of Committee meetings and it had been his impression that the particular elements had not been settled. At the previous Committee meeting, he continued, he and Ms. Steffan had attempted to present proposed evaluation forms which they thought met the proposed elements and Ms. Seeber had expressed that the forms were not appropriate. He said this was a tough and involved process and everyone was trying to do the best job possible. He stated he was supportive of the performance evaluation process for not only himself, but for all of the County Departments and staff. Mr. Dusek expressed he was looking at the proposed County Administrator performance evaluation form from not only his perspective but also from the perspective of a future County Administrator. He said the proposed form presented at this meeting did not provide a good assessment for the County Administrator position. He stated the County had a Human Resources Director with a considerable amount of experience and knowledge who was recommending a different form and he requested the Committee members consider Mr. Steffan's advice. As someone who would be evaluated, Mr. Dusek continued, he hoped to have a good form that he could have confidence in. He noted any future applicant for the County Administrator position would require confidence that they would be fairly evaluated on their performance. He opined this was a critical and important process because the County Administrator position was at the top of the organizational structure in Warren County.

Mr. Girard asked who had provided the Genesee County Legislature form presented at the previous Committee meeting and Mr. Dusek replied it had been presented by himself and Ms. Steffan. Mr. Girard recalled the Committee had discussed as a group that they had wanted to include some additional elements into the proposed form. Now, he continued, the Committee was being presented with 18 additional performance elements and he felt as if the process was moving backwards. Ms.

Steffan stated one of the purposes of a performance evaluation was to provide the employee with performance expectations. At the beginning of the performance period, she continued, the employer was setting the performance expectations and expected behaviors for the employee. Mr. Girard asked if the Genesee County Legislature form had accomplished that goal because he had felt the form was a little simplistic. He questioned why the forms presented at the previous meeting were not more detailed so the process could move forward. Ms. Steffan apprised the Genesee County Legislature, County Manager Performance Evaluation Form presented at the previous meeting did contain a lot of detail and she recalled the form had contained 13 performance elements. She acknowledged the form had evaluated the elements in a different manner; however, she said it had mirrored the goals which had been provided by the County Administrator.

Mr. Brock stated he had previously worked in the private sector and when it came to performance evaluations, the top executives were evaluated based on the measurements of the employees under their supervision. He said if a supervisor's employees were doing a good job, then the supervisor was doing a good job of providing leadership. He expressed that by starting with the top position of County Administrator and working their way down, the County would not have the proper measurements established to evaluate the position appropriately. Mr. Dusek agreed and noted this had been discussed at the previous Committee meeting. He said typically when an organization initiated a performance evaluation process, there was a strategic plan in place and all of the evaluations were in place before commencing. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Taylor opined the Committee members were not disagreeing about the proposed form, they were merely discussing the performance elements. Ms. Seeber said she had read the minutes of the previous Committee meetings and had watched the videos on YouTube. She commented she felt as if she were the secretary of the Committee which was an uncomfortable position. She mentioned that two meetings prior the Committee had discussed the fact that they did not want a large number of performance elements and wanted to keep it simple. She pointed out the Committee had looked at 6 or 7 examples and she noted they had asked her to complete some research and bring back those examples. She said although the Committee members had indicated they wanted to keep it simple, they were now looking at 12 performance elements on a Genesee County form and 18 elements suggested by Ms. Steffan. She acknowledged the Genesee County form did encompass some of the 5 performance elements previously decided on by the Committee. Ms. Seeber said she had developed the titles on her proposed form based on the categories used by Ms. Steffan at the previous Committee meeting. She asked if the Committee members wanted the form to be simple and brief as previously discussed or if they wanted it to contain 12 to 18 performance elements. She expressed Chairman Geraghty had been clear that he wanted the form to be brief and Mr. Taylor agreed the form should be as brief as possible but it also needed to be a quality document for evaluating the County Administrator position.

Mr. Dusek recalled he and Ms. Steffan had presented some proposed forms at the previous Committee meeting which were appropriate and Ms. Seeber had objected to the forms because she felt they did not follow the desired format. He stated Ms. Seeber had requested to develop a draft evaluation form and the Committee had agreed to the request. He opined he had not felt the Committee had been opposed to the forms presented at the previous meeting and he did not feel the forms were thoroughly considered because Ms. Seeber had objected to them. Mr. Dusek expressed his concern that Ms. Seeber felt like a secretary because as a Supervisor she should not. He stated it was important to delegate these responsibilities to staff members and he pointed out it was the responsibility of the Human Resources Department to develop the proposed forms to the Committee's satisfaction. Ms. Seeber countered she had hesitantly accepted the responsibility of

drafting a proposed form upon the request of the Committee. She said when the original email had been sent, it requested the Human Resources Department to take the 5 performance elements and draft them into a Warren County form. Ms. Seeber explained that her concern with the forms presented at the previous meeting was that they were Genesee County forms and not forms presented based on everything the Committee had previously discussed. She stated she had completed the task which was requested of her by the Committee members at the previous meeting.

Mr. Monroe suggested the Committee request Ms. Steffan and the Human Resources Department to draft an appropriate form for the performance evaluation of the County Administrator position. He stated he felt the concept of the evaluation being completed by the Executive Committee made sense as these were the Supervisors who worked most often with Mr. Dusek on major issues. He noted he had no issue with the concept of all 20 Supervisors having input towards the performance evaluation but he felt the final evaluation should be drafted by the Executive Committee. Mr. Taylor asked for a show of hands to determine which Committee members felt this was the appropriate direction and Messrs. Taylor, Monroe and Girard were in favor with Ms. Seeber and Mr. Vanselow opposed. It was the consensus of the Committee to request Ms. Steffan and the Human Resources Department to draft an appropriate form for the performance evaluation of the County Administrator position with each Supervisor having input towards the performance evaluation and the final evaluation drafted by the Executive Committee.

Mr. Brock said he did not disagree with Mr. Monroe or Ms. Steffan but one of the reasons that measurements were used in performance evaluations was because they were objective. He stated the Executive Committee should look at the nuances of leadership. He commented if they established how the individual Departments were operating he felt most reasonable Supervisors would agree that the County Administrator was meeting his objectives. He said he felt it would provide a limited perspective to have the Executive Committee complete the performance evaluation. He mentioned he would need to explain to his constituents why a particular salary increase was approved. He added he would need to be able to agree with the evaluation and vote on the salary increase. He opined it was unrealistic to have a small group, such as the proposed Executive Committee complete the performance evaluation. Mr. Brock stated that in business you were not as accountable to the workers as you were to the stockholders. He added in the case of the County, the stockholders were the constituents. He stated the Supervisors needed the power to have the information to make an informed decision on a salary increase.

Mr. Taylor said the Committee had requested Ms. Steffan to develop a proposed draft form for consideration at the next Committee meeting. Mr. Vanselow asked who had requested the memorandum written by Ms. Steffan. Ms. Steffan responded she had been asked to review the proposed performance evaluation forms and had written the memorandum based on her professional opinion. She stated she had a higher level of experience in this area and there was a lot of education that would need to go into establishing the performance evaluation process. She added it was not as much about the document as it was about the process. She said the goal was to set the performance expectations so that the employee's performance could be measured.

Following a brief discussion, it was determined that the next Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee meeting would be scheduled for Tuesday, February 17, 2015 at 9:30 a.m. and that Ms. Steffan would email the proposed form to Joan Sady, Clerk of the Board, on the Friday prior to the meeting for Mrs. Sady to forward to the Committee members and appropriate personnel.

Mr. Vanselow expressed that he felt the Committee had wasted their effort for the last couple of months. He said if the process was going to originate from the Human Resources Department then

that was the way they should have commenced. Mr. Taylor countered he did not feel it was a waste of time as the Committee had expressed their opinions and decided upon a different path.

As there was no further business to come before the Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee, on motion made by Mr. Girard and seconded by Mr. Monroe, Mr. Taylor adjourned the meeting at 12:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Charlene DiResta, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist